

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/730,333	12/05/2000	Christophe Laudamiel-Pellet	8356	8185
27752	7590 12/22/2004		EXAMINER	
THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY			JASTRZAB, KRISANNE MARIE	
	TUAL PROPERTY DIVIS IILL TECHNICAL CENT		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
6110 CENTER HILL AVENUE			1744	
CINCINNATI, OH 45224			DATE MAILED: 12/22/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/730,333	LAUDAMIEL-PELLE	ET ET AL.
ration, ration	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Krisanne Jastrzab	1744	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 02 December 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this application (1) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper rep ch places the applic	oly to a cation in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dath have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exten 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three more arned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THI te on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. S 36(a) and the appropriate ext fee. The appropriate ext the final Office action; or	See MPEP e extension fee ension fee under (2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>02 December 2004</u> 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF			et forth in
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:		
(a) M they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note I	pelow);		
(c) ☑ they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or s	simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected clair	ns.
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ction(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed	d amendment
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request fo application in condition for allowance because:		sidered but does NC	OT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	re newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	•		
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-31</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	roved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	-		
10.⊠ Other: Interview Summary attached		Krisanne Vastrzab Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1744	Sub

Continuation of 2. NOTE: the addition of a limitation to "normalization" of scent intensity is a new issue that would require further search and consideration.